L.R. No. 1377-01 Bill No. SB 353 Page 1 of 3 February 12, 2001

COMMITTEE ON LEGISLATIVE RESEARCH OVERSIGHT DIVISION

FISCAL NOTE

<u>L.R. No.</u>: 1377-01 <u>Bill No.</u>: SB 353

Subject: Education, Elementary and Secondary: Aid

<u>Type</u>: Original

Date: February 12, 2001

FISCAL SUMMARY

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON STATE FUNDS							
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004				
General Revenue	(\$0 to Unknown)	(\$0 to Unknown)	(\$0 to Unknown)				
State School Moneys	\$0	\$0	\$0				
Total Estimated Net Effect on <u>All</u> State Funds	(\$0 to Unknown)	(\$0 to Unknown)	(\$0 to Unknown)				

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON FEDERAL FUNDS							
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004				
Total Estimated Net Effect on <u>All</u> Federal Funds	\$0	\$0	\$0				

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON LOCAL FUNDS							
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004				
School Districts	\$0 to Unknown	\$0 to Unknown	\$0 to Unknown				

Numbers within parentheses: () indicate costs or losses.

This fiscal note contains 3 pages.

FISCAL ANALYSIS

L.R. No. 1377-01 Bill No. SB 353 Page 2 of 3 February 12, 2001

ASSUMPTION

Officials of **Department of Elementary and Secondary Education** stated that the proposal would allow school districts to propose tax increases which would be phased in over more than one year. Districts would have a voluntary roll back until the increases were fully implemented; however, district tax rates would be higher than those for the previous year and they would still be given credit for reassessment add-ons in the Foundation Formula.

The proposal could increase the cost to fully fund the Foundation Formula; however, officials of the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education have no way of estimating the number of school districts that would propose phased-in tax increases (or whether the voters would approve those increases).

They also noted that calculated levies would not be eliminated due to increased voluntary rollbacks; therefore, the proposal would not ever decrease the cost of fully funding state aid.

FISCAL IMPACT - State Government	FY 2002 (10 Mo.)	FY 2003	FY 2004
GENERAL REVENUE FUND			
<u>Cost</u> - Increased Transfers to State School	(\$0 to	(\$0 to	(\$0 to
Moneys Fund	Unknown)	Unknown)	Unknown)
ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON	<u>(\$0 to</u>	<u>(\$0 to</u>	<u>(\$0 to</u>
GENERAL REVENUE FUND	<u>Unknown)</u>	<u>Unknown)</u>	<u>Unknown)</u>
STATE SCHOOL MONEYS FUND			
Income - Increased Transfers from	\$0 to Unknown	\$0 to Unknown	\$0 to Unknown
General Revenue Fund	50 to Chrhown	50 to Chkhown	50 to Chritown
Cost - Increased Distributions to School	(\$0 to	(\$0 to	(\$0 to
Districts	Unknown)	Unknown)	Unknown)
ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON	\$0	\$0	\$0
STATE SCHOOL MONEYS FUND	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>40</u>
FISCAL IMPACT - Local Government	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004
	(10 Mo.)		
SCHOOL DISTRICTS			
Income - Increased State Aid	\$0 to Unknown	\$0 to Unknown	\$0 to Unknown
ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON	\$0 to Unknown	\$0 to Unknown	\$0 to Unknown
SCHOOL DISTRICTS			

FISCAL IMPACT - Small Business

No direct fiscal impact to small businesses would be expected as a result of this proposal.

GVB:LR:OD (12/00)

L.R. No. 1377-01 Bill No. SB 353 Page 3 of 3 February 12, 2001

DESCRIPTION

This proposal would modify the definition of operating levy for school purposes in 163.011(13). Currently, the reassessment add-on must be eliminated in the state aid formula when a school district increases its voluntary rollback. This proposal would allow the add-on to be applied as long as a district's actual tax rate did not decrease. (The actual tax rate means the adjusted tax rate in the Incidental and Teachers Funds, combined.)

This legislation is not federally mandated, would not duplicate any other program and would not require additional capital improvements or rental space. The proposal would not affect Total State Revenue.

SOURCES OF INFORMATION

Department of Elementary and Secondary Education

Jeanne Jarrett, CPA

Director

February 12, 2001